1	Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
2	on Northern Right Whale Research
3	in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.
4	
5	
6	
7	Scoping Meeting
8	
9	
10	
11	San Diego, California
12	December 10, 2005
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Reported by Claire A. Wanner, CSR No. 12965
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
2	on Northern Right Whale Research
3	in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Scoping Meeting,
13	commencing at the hour of 6:00 p.m. on Saturday,
14	December 10, 2005, at 1 Market Place, San Diego,
15	California, before Claire A. Wanner, Certified Shorthand
16	Reporter in and for the State of California.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
                MR. MICHAELSON: There are a lot of really
 2
        excellent seats right up in here in the front that are
 3
        going. So we highly encourage you to move forward.
        Everyone has brushed their teeth up here.
                 MR. LEATHERY: We showered.
 5
 6
                MR. MICHAELSON: Really, it's good. You can get
 7
        closer. We'll be okay. Much better.
 R
                My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work with a firm
 9
        called Cats & Associates. And I've been asked to perform
10
        as the moderator for tonight's scoping meeting. I'm sure
        you all know why you're here. And I notice that the vast
11
12
        majority took advantage of the poster stations.
13
                 We're very glad you took time out of your very
14
        busy day to be here at this scoping meeting for the
15
        Environmental Impact Statement on the Northern Right Whale
16
        research in the Atlantic. And in case you didn't already
        know, we're in San Diego, California. The purpose of
17
        these scoping meetings is to allow for earlier public
18
        notification of a proposed federal action. And I know I
19
20
        talked to a couple people who this is their first
21
        exposure. And what that means is we're very much at the
22
        front end of this process of preparing the environmental
23
        document. The purpose also of scoping is to provide the
24
        National Marine Fishery Service the opportunity to present
25
        this proposed action with two presentations from the two
```

```
1
     people seated to my right here.
```

2	But most importantly, this is an opportunity
3	before the draft document is prepared to seek your input
4	on the scope of the EIS. There are three meetings being
5	held. This is the middle one. As many of you may know we
6	held one in November at New Bedford, Massachusetts. The
7	National Meeting of Fishery Services tried to make this as
8	easy as possible, knowing that there are certain places
9	where researchers tend to congregate and having it on the
10	research on the population of where the researchers are.
11	We're here with you. And then the third meeting will be
12	in Silver Springs, Maryland, for those other NGOs and
13	regulators and others from around the Washington D.C.
14	area.
15	The agenda consists of basic information on
16	scoping the background on the NEPA process; and then for
17	those of you who may not know a lot about it or know
18	you're part of the big picture of all the different types
19	of activities that go on under the title of Right Whale
20	research. And then, if you're not familiar with NEPA,
21	they work for proposed action and alternatives.

22

23

24

25

So it's important to lay those out for you and understand that that's where we are at the beginning. But that's one of the things you can provide input on -alternatives or the scope of alternatives.

1	And the most important thing, once we finish,
2	we'll have an opportunity for each of you to offer other
3	comments.
4	The layout. Hopefully you figured out there's a
5	registration area. You took advantage of the staffed
6	exhibit area. We'll have the formal presentation and then
7	comments. If you want to comment, we ask that you sign in
8	so I can call people at the sign-in sheet. Those are
9	available. And I bet Deborah Hiller will hand them out.
10	If you raise your hand, she will bring you one.
11	In addition to oral comments, you can provide
12	written comments; and you can turn those in tonight.
13	We'll be happy to take those. And the person seated to my
14	right right here this is Claire. She's going to be
15	helping us get a good transcript. So we'll have a
16	verbatim record of what is said here tonight. And as a
17	part of typing it away, she will also be making an audio
18	recording.
19	And with that I'd like to turn it over to Stephen
20	Leathery for our first presentation.
21	MR. LEATHERY: Hi. My name is Steve Leathery,
22	and I'm in charge of permits division and all sorts of
23	resources and headquarters of the National Marine Fishery

Service in Silver Spring. Our division issues scientific

research permits for U.S. citizens globally for endangered

24

25

1	species marine mammals. And we also issue small-take
2	authorizations under the Environmental Protection Act for
3	activities that may harm marine mammals. And that would
4	be things like coastal marine construction, naval sonar
5	and other Department of Defense activity, and oil and gas
6	oceanographic research using air guns among others.
7	This is a language out of the National
8	Environment Policy Act. Those of you that are not

Environment Policy Act. Those of you that are not familiar with it, NEPA is a Sunshine Law. It requires the federal government to disclose its activities and arrange reasonable alternatives to proposed activities. It invites the public to participate in the process -- especially under an environmental impact statement such as this -- where we produce a draft and then take comments on the draft and then the final. You can read the language there that's right out of the act.

And the requirement is an analysis of the potential environmental consequences. And that could be both good consequences and bad consequences. So even if it's something that's going to be a benefit to the environment, we're still required to take a look at that. And again, the public involvement in the process is key.

Components of the proposed action and reasonable range of alternatives; a description of the affected environment; potential environmental consequences of the

1 action; mitigations; and consideration of the public input 2 and comments. And beyond the public, we also invite other 3 federal agencies to come; such as, the Marine Mammal Commission, Minerals Management Service, and others. 5 These are the full range of environmental factors 6 and environmental impact statement consideration. In this 7 case the fundamentally important things are the endangered 8 species in marine mammals and also the cumulative 9 impacts -- the last impact on the one list. And we would 10 consider all these other things; but for the sake of this document, those will be some of the really key components 11 12 of the analysis. 13 This is the phase in an EIS process. You are in 14 the first sub-bullet in the scoping phase. Lewis 15 mentioned that we've already had one scoping meeting. This is the second, and we'll have a third in Silver 16 17 Spring. We'll work to take the comments that are given 18 during scoping either in writing or orally at these

meetings. We'll consider those and develop a draft EIS,
and then we'll publish that. And then there will be a
comment period where the public can comment on what our
draft says or doesn't say. And then we'll consider all
those comments and produce a final Environmental Impact
Statement. And the final EIS includes a response to any
comment that we receive. Any comment that we receive we

```
1
        have to respond and give a public response to that
 2
        comment. And then we issue it and have a record of
 3
        decision. And all along the way there are opportunities
        for public involvement and input. The key part of that is
 5
        the input from the research community. We really want to
 6
        hear from researchers and others with a knowledge of
 7
        research techniques and with the biology and life history
 8
        and antigenic impacts to Right Whales.
 9
                 Here's our tentative schedule. We're in scoping
10
             We hope to go through and develop this and publish a
        now.
        draft by around November 2006, take a look at the public
11
        comments, do a final document, and then try and get that
12
13
        completed hopefully by August of 2007.
14
                 And now I'm going to turn it over to one of my
15
        staff -- Tammy Adams -- to go through more of the details.
16
                 MS. ADAMS: As most of the audience, I'm a little
17
```

MS. ADAMS: As most of the audience, I'm a little jet-lagged; and I've over-compensated with too much caffeine. So if I talk too quickly, I apologize in advance. I'm going to talk about the research, the proposed action, and alternatives that we are seeking input on.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So currently we have 13 permits authorizing research on Right Whales, and that includes both the Atlantic and Pacific stocks or populations. The permits expire sometime between 2006 and 2010 depending on when

```
1
        they were issued. All of our permits are typically issued
 2
        for a five-year period. The permits combined offer; a
 3
        total of over 70 researchers. That includes the principal
        investigators and all of their listed coinvestigaters.
 5
        And there are a number of categories of Northern Right
 6
        Whale research that we've identified and grouped these
 7
        into. And as you probably would expect, we encompass
 8
        things like close approach for observations, take photo
 9
        ID, sampling -- which can range from collecting sloughed
10
        skin or taking biopsy samples or doing ultrasound
        measurements; and tagging -- putting devices on the animal
11
12
        or implantable tags into the animal to collect information
13
        on a variety of things, such as habitat use; and just
14
        general population monitoring and assessment work. How
15
        many are there? Where do they go?
16
                 We also authorize some acoustic playback or what
17
        are called "controlled exposure experiments," where we
18
        play sounds to the animals and observe their responses.
        And, of course, we have to permit disentanglement response
19
20
        because of the Endangered Specious Act. To do that
21
        requires a permit.
                 What are the research needs for recovery? The
22
23
        Right Whales have a recovery plan under the Endangered
        Species Act. And that identifies a variety of the types
24
```

of research that need to be done including detection,

25

```
1
        which is the sort of population monitoring. Where are the
 2
        whales? Entanglement and stranding response. Because
 3
        entanglement in gear is perhaps one of the biggest threats
        that face Right Whales in the Atlantic. Looking at
 5
        contaminant levels and how that affects the species.
 6
        How's the general health of the population? Again,
 7
        habitat-use patterns. Where do they go, and what do they
 R
        need? What do they need when they go there? And just
 9
        monitoring status and trends in abundance; and
10
        distribution is an indicator of how the species is going.
                 So the study area for this EIS includes two
11
12
        places. One is the Atlantic Ocean, which we permit
13
        research that takes place in both the known summering
14
        grounds in the north Atlantic off of New England; and also
15
        the known calving grounds out of the southeast of Georgia
16
        and Florida; as well as the migratory corridor between
17
        those two places. We put tags -- our researcher put tags
18
        on animals to figure out where else they might go. So
        there's an unknown locations' category.
19
20
                 And in the Pacific Ocean where we know less about
21
```

Right Whales, we have some people studying where the think the potential summering grounds are. So that's an action area. And also just opportunistic locations. If someone spots a right whale, we have permits that allow them to tag it and photo ID it. The purpose of permitting these

22

23

24

25

things is to find out about Right Whales. And the purpose of knowing of where the research is going is so we assess what else is in the environment; that that could be affected by authorizing the permits.

So if you looked at the posters, you saw that we have defined a purpose and need for this document. And the purpose is to provide -- the purpose of issuing the permits is to provide an exception to MMPA and ESA prohibition on takes through issuance of permits for scientific purpose related to recovery. And the reason we need to issue these permits is to facilitate this research. Particularly, that that will result in information that will aid NMFS in doing things; taking actions that will help the species get off the endangered species list and recover.

The proposed action, as Steve discussed -- it was something that we -- what we're talking about doing is -- that we're seeking input on is to issue permits to those people who have the appropriate qualifications to do research that has been determined as critical or essential to the conservation needs of the species. These would be things that are identified in the species recovery plan or otherwise have come up through scientific study. And we're calling this also our "minimum take level." This would be the minimum amount of research that needs to be

One alternative to this action alternative we're

calling the "maximum allowable take level." And this

would be based on the combination of current and

future-proposed research to help us determine what that

level would be. And essentially we would issue permits

until we have reached a number of authorized take that is

just below the jeopardy threshold under the ESA. And for

those of you that don't know, Section 7 of the Endangered

done to get the information needed to recover the species.

chose of jou that don't know, section , of the shadingered

10 Species Act requires, as a federal agency, to ensure that

11 any action we undertake will not further jeopardize the

continued existence of the species that is the subject of

13 the permit.

1

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have a no-action alternative which is required by NEPA to be evaluated as a comparison. And there are no action alternatives. It would be the conduct the research already allowed under existing permits. That means that no new permit would be issued to replace expired permits, starting in 2006. In 2010 no research would be authorized for Right Whales. No amendments would be granted to existing permits to allow modifications of research that is underway. And as I said when the permits expire in 2010, we would not issue permits to renew that.

Other alternatives we have considered, but that we may not carry forward, would be a permit moratorium ${\sf var}$

1 where we do not issue any permits and suspend those that 2 are -- the second one would be suspension of intrusive 3 research. So we would allow permits to continue doing things like aerial surveys; and permit ID and behavioral 5 observation because, without the permit, people to do what is defined as intrusive, such as taking or attaching tags to animals. And another would be the status quo which 8 would be to review the existing permits as they expire to 9 maintain the current level of research.

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We, at this point, decide not to consider these alternatives further because they do not meet the purpose of proposed action, which is to gain information to recover the species. Nor do they allow collection of information critical to the survival of the species to be collected by modifications to the perimeter in other ways.

The major environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS include the agency's information needs for conservation and recovery of the species. And pensions -those come from the species recovery plan. We are looking at what types of research activities should be permitted or need to be permitted. What are the appropriate mitigation measures? And then looking at types of research activities to be permitted and mitigation measures to go with them. We're asking for input from the public on what the temporal and geographic of the scale of

the research that should be authorized, as well as the
sample sizes that would be appropriate for various methods
and questions that need to be answered. And also that is
something the foundation of NEPA -- we're looking at the
cumulative impact of research activities on Right Whales
and their environment.

The advantages of doing this EIS are that it provides full disclosure to the public of our decision -- making. All the factors that we look at in deciding which permits to issue provides a comprehensive look at all possible permits at one time. It assisted in development of mitigation measures and what we could -- are the best management practices such as: What are the appropriate sample sizes, types, and place to do different types of research? And it would reduce our need to state permit-specific level, which maybe comes as new adaptations came in. We may not do the analysis. And they could be issued more quickly and facilitate the appropriate research.

So we're asking for a number of different types of information during this public-scoping process. And one of them is what types of research need to be permitted. So we're asking -- in answering that question are three critical research needs for species that have not been identified in the recovery plan. And if so --

what are they? And how would identifying those things
benefit the species. And we're asking the most
appropriate methods to obtain the information needed. So
if there's more than one way to find out what the species
contaminate load is; and one of them might have a lower
impact on the population. We're asking for more
information about that.

R

We're looking for the appropriate level of research, how much specific activity is enough for our needs, and can there be too much. This is a question, among other things, of statistical analysis. If your sample size is not large enough, perhaps you need to redesign your study. If your sample size is too big, maybe you could dedicate some of your effort to answering an additional question.

One of the questions we're asking to the public to give input on is whether NMFS should set limits on activities. You can only do "X" number of this type of activity in a year. Should there be different standards or more restrictions for age or reproductive classes? Should we be more protective of females with newborn calves?

We're also looking for information on how to best coordinate research. Should we limit the number of permits, for example? And should we require researchers

1	operating under different permits to use the same or
2	comparable methods to maximize the information they
3	collect for our needs?
4	We're also looking for information on
5	qualifications of research. If we're issuing permits, for
6	example, for biopsy sampling whales is there a minimum
7	amount of research experience a person should have before
8	they're allowed to approach these animals and take an
9	intrusive sample from them?
10	And we're also looking for information on the
11	potential effects of research. And that could be not just
12	from Right Whales, but from other species of whales and
13	other species of marine mammals and other animals in
14	general. And we're looking for recommendations on study
15	designs that could help us look for answers, where the
16	existing research does not tell us what to expect.
17	That's the end of my presentation, and I'm going
18	to turn it back over to Lewis.
19	MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Deborah,
20	have you had anyone hand in a card? I have one card. Can
21	you bring that up to me? Ordinarily, we take a break here
22	to kind of organize all of these cards. I don't think
23	we're going to need a really big break at the moment.
24	Is there anyone who since they've heard this
25	presentation has been inspired to provide some input?

Can you give her a card, and she can fill it out. Let me just give you the mechanics of this. Because we have plenty of time and a few of you, we're going to start the process the way we conduct it at all the meetings in order to make it fair; which is, have you sign in and give you four minutes to offer your comment. After we've given everyone their first chance. If people who've already spoken want to come up for a second helping, we're going to do that as well; because we do want to hear from you.

It's being audiotaped, so we just ask people to come up to the microphone and speak slowly and clearly, so we can make sure we get a good record of what was said. And I want to remind again, oral comments are great; however, written comments are given the same weight and consideration as oral comments. And since many people are deathly afraid of public speaking, we're very happy to take your written comments as well. And particularly on something of this nature with its research and scientific aspect -- we anticipate many of you will provide comments and have difficulty fitting that into four minutes anyway. You probably want to provide some very detailed, written comments.

We have written comment sheets. If you want to fill them out or hand them in tonight, that's great. If you want to mail them in, just make sure that they arrive

```
at NMFS by January 31, 2006. There a number of handouts
```

- 2 that have information about e-mail and fax and all that
- 3 stuff. But NMFS is trying to make it as easy as possible.
- 4 You can fax it or e-mail it or mail it in.
- 5 There's also information available in addition to
- 6 the Web site. A lot of this is available online. There
- 7 is information about scoping. And the documents
- 8 themselves will eventually be put into libraries in key
- 9 places around where we've held these scoping meetings and
- on the NMFS home page.
- 11 If you didn't already register when you came in
- 12 because you thought "I'm not speaking tonight," or you
- missed it because you came into the poster station, we are
- 14 trying to pull up as good a mailing list as we can to keep
- 15 you all informed. So please fill that out -- if you
- 16 haven't already -- if you want to stay up-to-date and in
- 17 the loop on what happens during the development of the
- 18 EIS. So there's the five-minute break I'm not going to
- 19 take.
- 20 All right. And no need for backup sides. So
- 21 we're all -- the two names that we have are Jessica
- 22 Koelsch and Sharon Young. And in my extremely high-tech
- 23 way of indicating when four minutes are up -- when you've
- been speaking for three minutes, I'll put up one finger
- 25 like that. And then when four minutes are up, I'll close

1 my hand like that. Again, we're more than happy to take 2 second helpings. Just to make this process consistent 3 from meeting to meeting, that's how we're going to do it. So, Jessica Koelsch, would you please come to the 5 microphone and adjust it to your height and make sure it's 6 on. 7 MS. KOELSCH: I didn't know if I was going to 8 speak or not. I'm with Ocean Conservancy, and I came to 9 listen and learn. But I'm still reviewing the issue, and 10 we'll submit comments in writing. But just some initial thoughts. I appreciate the efforts you guys are doing in 11 12 looking at this. I believe it definitely needs a careful 13 coordination of the research projects and ensure that the 14 project is designed to help the Right Whales recover and 15 survive and not cause unexpected harm. 16 We definitely recommend prioritizing and streamlining the permits and projects that are most 17 18 relevant to the species recovery, specifically ship strike and fishery entanglement issues. Presently, we lean 19 20 towards the proposed action on the minimum-take 21 alternative -- however, definitely need to take a closer 22 look at it. Concerned about just making sure that you 23 don't construe the minimum take so narrowly to exclude

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting and Video, Inc.

studies that might take a longer-term approach. But one

of the big take-home messages is that NMFS needs to act

24

25

```
1
        quickly; and based on the science that you already have in
 2
        existence regarding ship strike and entanglement. And
 3
        that's all I got for now. I might say more later.
                 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Sharon Young?
 5
                 MS. YOUNG: Sharon Young with Humane Society,
 6
        United States. As Jessica said, I just want to briefly
 7
        speak because we'll be submitting much more extensive
 8
        comments in writing, which will be no surprise to the
 9
        agency.
10
                 I think in general I echo some of what Jessica
        said. My concerns with regard to the research in Right
11
12
        Whales are that there very clear problems for the
13
        researchers -- as matter of the permits process -- for how
14
        to coordinate among researchers. I think one of the
15
        problems in the past has been that people do not always
16
        coordinate and are not aware of who's doing what or how
17
        they can piggyback on some other people's stuff. And some
18
        of the goals -- you're figuring out areas; if you're going
        to tag an animal; if that tagging an animal that we don't
19
20
        already know where it goes for the winter. So those sorts
21
        of coordination -- that sort of coordination is really
22
        critical because it doesn't always happen in the field.
23
        People that are doing the -- I don't work with the people
        that do ID, the biopsy on tagging. So there are --
24
25
        researchers are required to coordinate and assure that
```

1 they're working together.

I also agree that there needs to be greater priority given to certain types of activities and other permits for doing -- need to be streamlined under the harassment takes. But in the scheme of things -- given the dire straits of the species, and the knowledge that we look about mid Atlantic migratory quarters on the East R Coast and about the habitat use of the West Coast Right Whales it's really important that we streamline those processes for people out there looking for them.

On the other hand, I think that invasive research does require a certain amount of additional analysis to try to determine impact. And I do believe that there are certain categories of animals -- calves for sure and females -- as they deserve the greatest consideration.

And then the only other comment that I wanted to offer right now is that -- I'm not sure how this can be done by the permitting process. But I think it is really important to underscore what the agency has said. Can it prioritize the type of research that is done; that we know proximal costs is entitlement and ship strikes? Research that determine ways to reduce those impacts is really critical. Other research -- which I think is bonified research and is helpful in understanding the dynamics, factors involved in the recovery, or lack thereof in the

1	species I think may need to be a lower degree of
2	priority. Both on terms on research that are given to
3	research and to the priority in which permits are analyzed
4	in order to save time. In order genetic research is
5	important, but I think it contributes to the short-term
6	resolution and therefore a lower-level priority.
7	MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anybody
8	else who'd like to bolden by others' trip to the
9	microphone that would like to say anything? And would
10	you like second helpings? You didn't use all four so
11	I'm guessing you didn't. Maybe something just popped into
12	your head. We're hear; you're hear. At the other meeting
13	we did something we think you're going to like. We closed
14	out the meeting, ended the record, and then had just kind
15	of an informal Q and A. Whatever else anybody might have
16	on their mind; or just some questions that didn't get
17	cleared up because you were going to go poster station.
18	So with that we will adjourn the meeting at
19	8:04 p.m.
20	
21	(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 8:04 p.m.)
22	* * * *
23	
24	

1	I, Claire A. Wanner, a Certified Shorthand
2	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:
3	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before
4	me at the time and place herein set forth; that any
5	witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
6	testifying, were placed under oath; that a verbatim record
7	of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand
8	which was thereafter transcribed under my direction;
9	further, that the foregoing is an accurate transcription
10	thereof.
11	
12	
13	Dated: This, day of,,
14	at San Diego, California.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Claire A. Wanner
21	CSR No. 12965
22	
23	
24	
25	